

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 31, 2007. Claims 4 and 9 are presented for examination, both of which are in independent form. Claims 4 and 9 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 4 and 9 were objected to on the following informalities: Claim 4, line 12, “the received image” should be --the received image data--; and Claim 9, line 12, “the received image” should be --the received image data--. Applicant carefully reviewed the claims and made the suggested amendments. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection has been obviated, and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states in paragraph 4 that the claims recite an apparatus/method for transmitting “image data” and that the “received image data” is stored in memory. The Office Action asserts that it is unclear how the first “image data” is different from the “received image data.” Applicant has carefully reviewed the claims and amended them as deemed necessary to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The Office Action further states in paragraph 5 that the phrases “as being used as a transmitter” and “as being used as a receiver” are unclear since it is uncertain as to what is being used as the transmitter and repeater. Applicant has carefully reviewed the claims and replaced the phrase “as being used” with --when said apparatus is being used--. Applicant believes that the rejection has been obviated and its withdrawal is, therefore, respectfully

requested.

The Office Action also states in paragraph 6 that the phrase “image sender information” is unclear in that it is uncertain as to whether the referenced “sender” is the original sender or the middle device that performs ring-type multiple address transfer. Applicant has carefully reviewed the claims and replaced the phrase “image sender information” with --transmitter information--. The term “transmitter information” is clearly defined in the specification at least at page 6, lines 13-23.

The Office Action states in paragraph 7 that the phrase “the image data” on line 10 of Claim 4 lacks antecedent basis. Applicant has carefully reviewed the claims and replaced the term “the image data” with --received image data. Applicant believes that the rejection has been overcome and its withdrawal is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,170,428 (Watanabe).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 4 and 9 in terms that more clearly define what he regard as their invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 4 is directed to a communication apparatus adapted to perform ring-type multiple-address transmission. The apparatus includes: (1) a memory, arranged to store image data; (2) a reception unit, arranged to receive image data and store the received image data to the memory; (3) a transmission unit, arranged to transmit the received image data stored in the memory; (4) an identification unit, arranged to identify whether or not the received image data is

data assigned to be subjected to ring-type multiple-address transfer; and (5) a processor arranged to add transmitter information to the received image data and to cause the transmission of the received image data with transmitter information added thereto when said apparatus is being used as a transmitter when the start of ring-type multiple-address transfer is selected, or to cause the transmission of the received image data without transmitter information added thereto when the apparatus is being used as a repeater station when the transfer of ring-type multiple-address transfer is selected. The transmitter information provides information identifying the received image data.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 is a processor arranged to add transmitter information to the received image data and to cause the transmission of the received image data with transmitter information added thereto when the apparatus is being used as a transmitter when the start of ring-type multiple-address transfer is selected, or to cause the transmission of the received image data without transmitter information added thereto when the apparatus is being used as a repeater station when the transfer of ring-type multiple-address transfer is selected, wherein the transmitter information provides information identifying the received image data.

Watanabe has been described sufficiently in previous Office Actions, and it is not believed necessary to repeat that description herein. The Office Action states on page 5 that the “Examiner agrees with the applicant, in that the process performed by the current invention might be different (i.e., the transmitter information is not added by the controller of fax 2 in the transmission according to fig. 3B of the original Drawings) than Watanabe teaches.” Applicants have amended the Claims to further clarify this distinction. Applicant has found nothing in

Watanabe that would teach or suggest “a processor arranged to add transmitter information to the received image data and to cause the transmission of the received image data with transmitter information added thereto when said apparatus is being used as a transmitter when the start of ring-type multiple-address transfer is selected, or to cause the transmission of the received image data without transmitter information added thereto when said apparatus is being used as a repeater station when the transfer of ring-type multiple-address transfer is selected, wherein the transmitter information provides information identifying the received image data,” as recited in Claim 4 (emphasis added).

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant’s opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claim 9 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 4, and is believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 4.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to

advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 623635v1